MS Word Exhibit 300 for DME/Mixed (BY2008) (Form) / ESMD - Integrated Collaborative Environment (Item)

Form Report, printed by: System Administrator, **Jan 31, 2007**

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">OVERVIEW</td></tr>
</table>

General Information	
1. Date of Submission:	Aug 25, 2006
2. Agency:	026
3. Bureau:	00
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	ESMD - Integrated Collaborative Environment
Investment Portfolio:	BY OMB 300 Items
5. Unique ID:	026-00-01-02-01-2411-00
(For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	

All investments
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?
(Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)
Mixed Life Cycle
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?
FY2007
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap.
The Integrated Collaborative Environment (ICE) Program provides a common repository of the authoritative data for Exploration System Mission Directorate (ESMD). ICE is a web-centric environment which will be used by industry, academia and government for sharing, collaborating, integrating, accessing and controlling management information and product data definition for all ESMD products. The scope of ICE includes all program and product information, including: all requirement, schedule, risk and configuration management information to all engineering design, analysis and test. The objectives of the ICE Program are to: 1. Provide the laboratories, Centers, Directorates, academic institutions, prime contractors and subcontractors a single web portal through which they can store, manage and find all directorate program and mission related data, information and products. 2. Link all such related program and product data together, so the relationships between them can be quickly navigated both by end users and other systems. 3. Provide a common implementation approach, including documentation, engagement and design models from which products are configured and delivered to the Customer. 4. To automate ESMD processes; particularly around the data produced and used in ESMD processes. 5. Implement ICE as an integration of existing COTS applications; in order to reduce risks and total lifecycle costs. Provide value throughout the ESMD Program, implementing each project solution as series of production systems in short (60-90 day) intervals. 6. Base solution delivery on business needs and opportunities and business-driven prioritization.¬ 7. Accessibility from anywhere in the world including the International Space Station (ISS) and the Space Shuttle Orbiter Performance gaps ICE closes: Improved Mission Assurance and Mission Safety achieved by availability of all data related to ESMD products during ESMD operations. Reduced ESMD Program/Project Performance Risk by providing better program visibility, control and decisions throughout the program life cycle. Compresses ESMD Program/Project Delivery Schedules by providing a single collaboration environment enabling the compression of numerous critical process life cycles. Reduces ESMD Program/Project Cost by improving communication amongst the various systems and sub systems along for faster incorporation of designs and completion of tasks.
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?
Yes
9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?

May 1, 2006

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	
Yes	
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.	
Yes	
12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	
Yes	
12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	
No	
12.b.1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
12.b.2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
12.b.3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?	
Yes	
If "yes," select the initiatives that apply:	

Human Capital	
Budget Performance Integration	Yes
Financial Performance	
Expanded E-Government	Yes
Competitive Sourcing	
Faith Based and Community	
Real Property Asset Management	
Eliminating Improper Payments	
Privatization of Military Housing	
R and D Investment Criteria	
Housing and Urban Development Management and Performance	
Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives	
Right Sized Overseas Presence	
Coordination of VA and DoD Programs and Systems	

13.a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?
Budget Performance Integration - ICE enables linkage of budget resources to program results, and enables program performance information to make better budget and management decisions within ESMD. Expanded E-Government -ICE is based on open system standards to promote interoperability and manages information technology resources better to improves service delivery by providing management information and product data for all products which are part of Exploration Systems.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?
Yes
14.a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?
Yes
14.b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?
Space and Flight Support
14.c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?
Adequate
15. Is this investment for information technology (See section 53 for definition)?
Yes

For information technology investments only:
16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)?
Level 1
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)
(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's 'high risk' memo)?
No
19. Is this a financial management system?
No
19.a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?
19.a.1. If "yes," which compliance area:
Not Applicable
19.a.2. If "no," what does it address?
19.b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A–11 section 52.
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Area	Percentage	
Hardware	0.11	
Software	30.89	
Services	67.99	
Other	1.01	
Total	100.00	⭐

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?
N/A
22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions

Name	Bessie Whitaker
Phone Number	256-544-4812
Title	MSFC Privacy Act Officer
Email	Bessie.H.Whitaker@nasa.gov

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?

Yes

SUMMARY OF FUNDING

SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (In Millions)

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The total estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

All amounts represent Budget Authority

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY	CY	BY
	2006	2007	2008
Planning:	4.022	3.801	3.629
Acquisition:	10.004	6.314	10.811
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	14.026	10.115	14.440
Operations & Maintenance:	5.910	5.946	5.224
TOTAL	19.936	16.061	19.664
Government FTE Costs	1.100	1.133	1.750
# of FTEs	4.0	4.0	6.0
Total, BR + FTE Cost	21.036	17.194	21.414

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies).

Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?

No

2.a. If "yes," how many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.

Budget Comments * Internal Use Only*

PERFORMANCE

Performance Information

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Table 1

	Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
1						
2						

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

Table 2

	Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvements to the Baseline	Actual Results
1	2005	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percentage of Data Availability	Percentage of ESMD data available through ICE in 2004	Improve to 70%	70%
2	2005	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Attendance Percentage	Percentage of registered users against users who have attended ICE user training in 2004	Raise to 40%	20%
3	2005	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Participation	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment in 2004	Improve to 60%	60%
4	2005	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Raise to 45%	40%

5	2006	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percentage of Data Availability	Percentage of ESMD data available through ICE	Maintain 70%	70%
6	2006	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Attendance Percentage	Percentage of registered users against users who have attended ICE user training	Raise to 40%	20%
7	2006	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Participation	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Improve to 60%	70%
8	2006	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Raise to 45%	40%
9	2007	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percentage of Data Availability	Percentage of ESMD data available through ICE	Maintain 70%	TBD
10	2007	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Attendance Percentage	Percentage of registered users against users who have attended ICE user training	Raise to 40%	TBD
11	2007	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Participation	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Improve to 75%	TBD
12	2007	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Raise to 45%	TBD
13	2008	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percentage of Data Availability	Percentage of ESMD data available through ICE	Maintain 70%	TBD
14	2008	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Attendance Percentage	Percentage of registered users against users who have attended ICE user training	Raise to 45%	TBD
15	2008	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Participation	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Maintain 75%	TBD
16	2008	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Raise to 50%	TBD
17	2009	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percentage of Data Availability	Percentage of ESMD data available through ICE	Maintain 70%	TBD
18	2009	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Attendance Percentage	Percentage of registered users against users who have attended ICE user training	Raise to 50%	TBD

19	2009	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Participation	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Improve to 80%	TBD
20	2009	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Raise to 55%	TBD
21	2010	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percentage of Data Availability	Percentage of ESMD data available through ICE	Maintain 70%	TBD
22	2010	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Attendance Percentage	Percentage of registered users against users who have attended ICE user training	Raise to 55%	TBD
23	2010	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Participation	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Improve to 85%	TBD
24	2010	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Raise to 55%	TBD
25	2011	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Percentage of Data Availability	Percentage of ESMD data available through ICE	Maintain 70%	TBD
26	2011	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Training	Attendance Percentage	Percentage of registered users against users who have attended ICE user training	Raise to 60%	TBD
27	2011	Processes and Activities	Management and Innovation	Participation	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Participation-Percentage of Exploration workers actively using the ICE environment	Maintain 85%	TBD
28	2011	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Percentage of registered users accessing the system per hour	Maintain 55%	TBD

Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

Yes

1.a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

Yes

2.a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

ESMD - Integrated Collaborative Environment

2.b. If "no," please explain why?

Service Reference Model

3. Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

Component: Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

Reused Name and UPI: A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

Internal or External Reuse?: 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Funding Percentage: Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

	Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	Service Type	Component	Reused Component Name	Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	Funding %
1	Enterprise Application Integration	All of the Ice environment COTS tools are integrated through an Enterprise Service Bus using COTS software	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			No Reuse	0.01

2	Configuration Management	All Items are configuration managed within ICE at the object level. ICE tracks for versions and iteration of all objects located within it	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Configuration Management			No Reuse	0.01
3	Workflow	ICE has multiple workflow engines which are used to automate delivery of data from customers and partners and to automate internal processes within Exploration systems such as change management	Process Automation Services	Tracking and Workflow	Process Tracking			No Reuse	0.01
4	Threaded Discussions	The ICE program allows for knowledge capture via threaded discussions related to any object in the PLM repository. This could include items such as parts, products, documents, workflows, change artifacts, etc.	Support Services	Collaboration	Threaded Discussions			No Reuse	0.01
5	Change Management	ICE implements a fully CMII compliant change management process. This change management functionality is used to manage change within the exploration systems mission directorate	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Change Management			No Reuse	0.01
6	B2G Integration	ICE provides both web services and standard B2G integration services with NASA IT's contractors and partners.	Customer Services	Customer Relationship Management	Product Management			No Reuse	0.01
7	Requirements Management	The COTS requirements management tool Cradle manages all Exploration Systems requirements.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Requirements Management			No Reuse	0.01
8	Program/Project Management	ICE is using a COTS tool Primavera to help with it's Integrated Master Schedule and Integrated Master Plan. This tool is being implemented through an Enterprise Bus as an ICE tool.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	0.02
9	Quality Management	All quality processes for Exploration Systems are managed through the ICE environment using its existing document and part management capability with the workflow engineer to implement the process.	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Quality Management			No Reuse	0.01

Technical Reference Model

4. To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component: Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications.

Service Specification: In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

SRM Component	Service Area	Service Category	Service Standard
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers

Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Portal Servers
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage
Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management
Configuration Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database
NEW	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers
Threaded Discussions	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers
Change Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers
Billing and Accounting	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers
Requirements Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers
Program / Project Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?
Yes
5.a. If "yes," please describe.
While ICE isn't leveraging existing components across the government. There is significant reuse within NASA of existing contracts, software, and hardware. Also there is an effort in place to share lessons learned, strategies, source code and possibly resources with DOD''s Future Combat Systems ACE project. There is also potential for this type of collaboration with DOE's Los Alamos facility which it considering implementing a similar system.
6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?
No
6.a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?
6.a.1. If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

Character Limitation Check		
EA General Questions:		⭐
SRM Table:		⭐
TRM Table:		⭐

Exhibit 300:

RISK

Risk Management

You should perform a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of the investment's life-cycle, develop a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

Yes

1.a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

Nov 17, 2005

1.b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

No

1.c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

2. If there is currently no plan, will a plan be developed?

2.a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?

2.b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: (O&M investments do NOT need to answer.)

A small part of the ICE budget is being used for development, modernization and enhancement during FY 2006-2008. In the future, when the investment involves extensive development activities, the cost estimates will be based on the best knowledge of the requirements and contingencies will be held commensurate with risk and uncertainty. In the analysis of alternatives approach to ICE, the risks have been taken into account in analyzing costs and making decisions on which approach to use.

COST & SCHEDULE

Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard – 748?	
Yes	
2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):	
2.a. What is the Planned Value (PV)?	
49.350	
2.b. What is the Earned Value (EV)?	
49.300	
2.c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?	
44.947	
2.d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information?	
Contractor and Government	
2.e. "As of" date:	
Jul 14, 2006	
3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)?	
1.00	
4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?	
-0.050	
5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?	
1.10	
6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV–AC)?	
4.353	
7. Is the CV or SV greater than 10%?	
No	⭐
7.a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?	
7.b. If "yes," explain the variance.	
Cost and schedule variances are within thresholds.	
7.c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?	
While variances are low to date it is policy for Actual Cost to Planned Cost is reviewed monthly by the Program Director and Business Manager. A variance explanation is provided by each project. At this time, no corrective actions are needed. Should a contrqacotr be resonible for the vaiance award fees will be withheld. If the contract doesn't have award fees seperation form that contractor would be considered. Should the variance stem from poor estimates or policy. This would require a change in policy within the ICE program in order to correct. Should there be a change in exploration systems program direction that results in achange in milestones this would require a rebaseline of milestones the following FY in order to provide better managment metric.	
7.d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"?	
44.947	
8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?	
No	
8.a. If "yes," when was it approved by OMB?	

Actual Performance against the Current Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003" / "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in $ Millions).

	Description of Milestone	Initial End Date	Initial Total Cost ($mil)	Planned End Date	Actual End Date	Planned Total Cost ($mil)	Actual Total Cost ($mil)	Schedule Variance (# of days)	Cost Variance ($mil)	Percent Complete
1	System Infrastructure	Sep 30, 2006	4.500	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	4.532	2.719	0	-1.813	100.00
2	Document Managment	Sep 15, 2005	7.500	Sep 15, 2005	Sep 15, 2005	7.432	6.317	0	-1.115	100.00
3	IMP/IMS online	Jul 15, 2005	7.500	Jul 13, 2005	Jul 13, 2005	7.448	7.446	0	-0.002	100.00
4	Procurment Eval System	Nov 12, 2005	6.000	Nov 12, 2005	Nov 11, 2005	6.125	5.500	-1	-0.625	100.00
5	Windchill Version Upgrade	Jan 20, 2006	5.500	Jan 19, 2006	Jan 19, 2006	5.448	5.200	0	-0.248	100.00
6	Parts Managment system Online	May 12, 2006	3.200	May 12, 2006	May 12, 2006	3.175	3.100	0	-0.075	100.00
7	Services Bus Online	Aug 4, 2006	4.750	Aug 1, 2006	Aug 14, 2006	4.875	4.600	9	-0.275	100.00
8	Change Management	Aug 18, 2006	4.000	Aug 19, 2006	Aug 19, 2006	4.050	4.025	0	-0.025	100.00
9	Portal redesign	Sep 29, 2006	4.200	Sep 30, 2006	Sep 30, 2006	4.090	4.090	0	0.000	100.00
10	Primaveria EVM / Schedule integration	Nov 3, 2006	2.200	Nov 3, 2006	Nov 3, 2006	2.125	1.950	0	-0.175	95.00

			DME	Steady State	Total
Completion date: Current Baseline:	Sep 30, 2011	**Total cost: Current Baseline:**	49.300		49.300
Estimated completion date:	Sep 29, 2006	**Estimate at completion:**	44.947		44.947